

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are currently pending in the present application.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Examiner Douglas Blair granted a telephone interview with Attorney Douglas Owens on September 13, 2005, during which it was agreed that *Xu* does not anticipate the recitations of Claims 1 and 4, and that the previously presented arguments would be re-presented below for reconsideration. Accordingly, the arguments discussed during the above-identified telephone interview are enclosed herein below.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has again rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Xu et al.* (U.S. 6,738,362).

As stated above, the Examiner has rejected independent Claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Xu*. With regard to independent Claims 1 and 4 the Examiner asserts that *Xu*, col. 8, line 57-col. 9, line 23, teaches an ISP server for Internet Protocol (IP) tunneling between the ISP router of the FA network and an ISP router of the VPN, and a router network for routing the FA network and the VPN, and receiving and forwarding the data using an IP tunnel to a correspondence node. However, upon reviewing *Xu*, it is respectfully submitted that neither the cited section, nor any other section, teaches these recitations of Claims 1 and 4.

More specifically, in the present invention, tunneling is performed between an edge (ISP) router of an FA network and an edge router of a VPN network using an ISP server maintaining all of the ISP routers of the IP network. However, in *Xu*, a tunneling for transmitting data to a mobile node located in an FA network is generated between a Home Tunneling Agent of an HA and an FA.

Additionally, as previously presented, in the present invention, an HA stores the VPN service desired by a MN when initially storing a location information. However, referring to col. 6 and Fig. 2A of *Xu*, a home registration agent (18A) performs only a location registration of a mobile node by

receiving a location registration request message from an FA. That is, *Xu* does not disclose storing the VPN service for the MN, as recited in Claims 1 and 4.

In response to these arguments, the Examiner asserted that the pending claims do not recite storing the VPN service for the MN. However, as was discussed and agreed upon during the telephone interview, this assertion is not correct. Therefore, based on these arguments, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 4 are patentably distinct from *Xu*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Additionally, dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-8, which depend from Claims 1 and 4, respectively, are also believed to be in condition for allowance, at least due to their dependencies.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516